



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/829,068	04/20/2004	Marco Cavaleri	PC 19450C	6785
23913	7590	01/31/2008	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC			PESELEV, ELLI	
Steve T. Zelson			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
150 EAST 42ND STREET				1623
5TH FLOOR - STOP 49				
NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/31/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/829,068	CAVALERI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Elli Peselev	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.

2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                    2b)  This action is non-final.

3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

4)  Claim(s) 65-71 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6)  Claim(s) 65-71 is/are rejected.  
7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All    b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
  
4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 13, 2007 has been entered.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 65-71 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malabarba et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,750,509).

Malabarba et al disclose dalbavancin (column 3). Malabarba et al further disclose a composition comprising dalbavancin derivative and a stabilizer (column 28, lines 9-12) and also disclose said composition in the form of a powder (column 28, line 13). Malabarba et al further disclose the combination of dalbavancin derivative in combination with a sugar, such as lactose (column 27, lines 54-56). Based on the teaching by Malabarba et al, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made to combine dalbavancin with a stabilizer in order to produce a more stable composition. Further, the resulting pH of said composition would be expected to be around 3.01. (Note the statement in the U.S. Patent No. 7,119,061 in column 23, lines 30-34 that a dalbavancin composition which has not been pH adjusted has a pH of about 3.01).

Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that Malabarba et al do not disclose or suggest a desire or a method to minimize MAG, do not disclose freeze-drying dalbavancin with a stabilizer or adjusting the pH thereof. This argument has not been found persuasive since Malabarba et al disclose that dalbavancin composition can be prepared in dry form in combination with a stabilizer. A dalbavancin composition in combination with a stabilizer would be expected to contain a

smaller amount of a degradation product MAG than a dalbavancin composition in the absence of a stabilizer. Further, as stated above, U.S. Patent 7,119,061 discloses that a dalbavancin composition, which has not been pH adjusted, has a pH of about 3.01.

It is noted that during personal interview on December 11, 2007, the attorney presented evidence that the composition of dalbavancin disclosed by Malabarba et al has a pH of 7 and that a composition having pH of about 3.01 disclosed in the U.S. Patent No. 7,119,061 is made in accordance with a method disclosed in the present application. With respect to the composition disclosed by Malabarba et al, applicant has not made of record any evidence in verified form showing the pH of the composition disclosed by Malabarba et al. Further, applicant has not explained the statement in the U.S. Patent No. 7,119,061 that dalbavancin composition which has a pH of bout 3.01 has not been pH adjusted.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elli Peselev whose telephone number is (571) 272-0659. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.00-4.30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Jiang can be reached on (571) 272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elli Peselev

*Elli Peselev*  
ELLI PESELEV  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200